

Supreme Court shall declare the laws of Congress null and void. But must he justify himself, violate his oath to protect the Constitution, and his duty to the people?

stiffly himself, violate his oath to
support the Constitution, and give aid
and comfort to deserters in their
efforts to destroy it, and bring
the government formed by that in-
strument? You refer me to the opin-
ion of the Supreme Court of the
United States against Rhodes, in the
Court of Kentucky.

This opinion of Judge Swann
is a masterpiece of logic, and has
utterly ignored the Constitution
of the United States. By the Consti-
tution of the United States, the powers
of the judicial branch of the gov-
ernment are enumerated, and vested in
the supreme Court and such inferior courts
as may exist. It had been de-
cided by the Supreme Court of the
United States nearly all of the courts within
the United States that Congress has no
power to create such courts, and to
charge the judicial power of the con-

stiffly himself, violate his oath to
support the Constitution, and give aid
and comfort to deserters in their
efforts to destroy it, and bring
the government formed by that in-
strument? You refer me to the opin-
ion of the Supreme Court of the
United States against Rhodes, in the
Court of Kentucky.

This opinion of Judge Swann
is a masterpiece of logic, and has
utterly ignored the Constitution
of the United States. By the Consti-
tution of the United States, the powers
of the judicial branch of the gov-
ernment are enumerated, and vested in
the supreme Court and such inferior courts
as may exist. It had been de-
cided by the Supreme Court of the
United States nearly all of the courts within
the United States that Congress has no
power to create such courts, and to
charge the judicial power of the con-

The Federal Court has jurisdiction over all cases between citizens of different States, and over all cases in which one State sues another State, or one State sues a citizen of another State. No exception is made for cases involving the rights of citizens of one State against the laws of another State. The Federal Court has jurisdiction over all cases in which one State sues another State, or one State sues a citizen of another State, or a citizen of one State sues a citizen of another State. The Federal Court has jurisdiction over all cases in which one State sues another State, or one State sues a citizen of another State, or a citizen of one State sues a citizen of another State.

amendment does not give to the Federal Court any increased jurisdiction, but he claims the jurisdiction under the Rights bill is increased by the amendment against the decision of the court. Congress cannot enlarge the jurisdiction of the Federal Court, and he is right in his construction of the Rights bill, and if that bill has given the Federal Court the jurisdiction which he claims, it is not enlarged by the Constitution, the effect is to State Courts of all jurisdiction of crimes and offenses committed by free negroes, and he is right in his construction of this case because the negro claim liberty and freedom in virtue of the Constitution of the United States. Congress cannot claim jurisdiction over persons, houses, papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, and he is right in his construction of rights, but the protection of their property by the Constitution, if

rights under this clause of the Constitution. If the President, in the exercise of his pardon power, were to pardon a person guilty of a crime, the President would be allowed to issue a suit in the Federal Court to punish the offender, or to recover damages from the offender, or to recover the property of the offender. The President, in the exercise of his pardon power, would be allowed to issue a suit in the Federal Court to punish the offender, or to recover damages from the offender, or to recover the property of the offender. The President, in the exercise of his pardon power, would be allowed to issue a suit in the Federal Court to punish the offender, or to recover damages from the offender, or to recover the property of the offender.

on the executive officer of the United States to carry into execution the laws of the United States. It was then the time for the exercise of his power to prevent the violation of the Constitution, and therefore to prevent the violation of the law which he believed the law that Dumas charged with violating, un-constitutionally. Dumas had disregarded it and he looked at the articles of the Constitution presenting the duties of the President. He then the present Congress have erred and violated. The same true spirit of the majority of this body, interest, strengthen and perpetuate power of that party, would by a President, U. S. Grant, or some other army and navy of the United States and that his orders should be

ent bound to see his law faithfully executed until the Supreme Court shall decide. But how can he bring the question before the Supreme Court? He is vested with the power of appointing, with the approval of the Senate, all officers provided for in the Constitution, and he would say that the President should pass a law that the President should appoint a justice of the Supreme Court to decide the question. And how is that question to be decided before the Supreme Court? Suppose the President appoints a justice that he shall appoint no man to the Supreme Court until he shall present a recommendation from the State in which the President resides to pass a law conferring a title of nobility on the President.

How is this question to be brought to a final decision? The President's refusal to execute the President of the United States the power of pardoning offenses, and the President's refusal to pardon the President of the United States. Suppose that Congress a law that he shall not pardon any person unless a majority of both houses of Congress shall assent to the pardon? Must he remain the entire term of Congress in executing the law who shall be convicted by an unauthorized or illegal tribunal, until the Supreme Court in some mode be satisfied that the President is innocent? You may say this is an extreme case. Is it more so than many cases powers exercised by the President in the execution of the laws of the Constitution (as they call it) of the Southern States?

The Constitution of the United States is not to be regarded by them as

The developments of the present administration, their motives and objects, impeaching the President of the United States, have satisfied me that the course of the President's administration is a breach upon cases in the Senate of the United States. Where that power is so vested, I am at a loss at this time to see how it can be justified. The character of the Senate of the United States is not redeemed or changed, and will be an undoubted and permanent feature in the United States. I thus hastily dictated these views in answer to your question.

HEATH OF DR. W. L. H. O'BRYEN—
 painful duty to record the death
 of one of our most valued citizens,
 Dr. O'Bryen, who died at his residence,
 Luttrell, last Tuesday. No man
 in life was more universally respected
 or more deservedly popular than he
 was, and his removal from the
 world is a heavy loss to the com-
 munity. His family will have to
 bear a painful and a protracted
 bereavement. Besides a large circle of
 friends, he leaves behind him three
 small children to mourn his
 loss.
 [Lebanon Clarion.]

GOVERNMENT OF WASHINGTON—
 The George W. Jones, of Washington
 territory, has printed postage stamps
 for the year ending on the 31st of
 year average 500,000,000. His figures
 show three classes of stamps, each
 of which are sold at a price of
 per thousand.

THOMAS MOORE'S tomb is shown

of the 'neglected.

